

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I understand our time would start in about 10 minutes. I am going to yield time to Senator BYRD, the time up to 4 o'clock, and then we will reclaim our time because we have speakers coming at 4. So such time as he may consume, until 4, I yield to Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield time from the Republican side to Senator BYRD until the hour of 4 p.m.?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I yield up until 4 o'clock to Senator BYRD, but I would not want it to come from the Republican time if others come and want to speak on the Republican time.

Mr. BYRD. If the distinguished Senator from Texas will yield, may I suggest that I only take—I think we have 5, 6 or 8 minutes—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is 7½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. May I suggest that I take that amount of time now and make a few remarks about Bob Schieffer. Then I will wait until 4:30. I could have more time at that point, as I understand it.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator for her efforts to accommodate me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

BOB SCHIEFFER'S TENTH ANNIVERSARY AT "FACE THE NATION"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this evening, politicians, celebrities, and newscasters alike will gather to honor one of the most trusted reporters in Washington; namely, Bob Schieffer of CBS News. Bob Schieffer has gained a reputation as a man of integrity, an honest man, a man who holds fairness and the truth in the highest regard.

Nothing better can be said about a politician, and certainly nothing better can be said about a news reporter. I will say that again about Bob Schieffer. Mr. Schieffer has gained the reputation as a man of integrity, an honest man, a man who holds fairness and the truth in the highest regard. We will remember that Plato, while visiting with Hiero, was asked, "Why have you come here?" Plato said, "I am looking for an honest man." So we have one here—a man of integrity, an honest man, a man who holds fairness and the truth in the highest regard. Now that is saying something in today's world. That is saying something about a news man.

Bob Schieffer is a Texan who started in journalism as a reporter for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. He moved on to a local television station and then to CBS. For 20 years, Bob was the network's Saturday evening news anchor. For the past decade, he has hosted "Face The Nation" on Sunday mornings. He has called Sunday mornings the smartest time period on television, saying, "It is the last place on television where people can lay out their

ideas about things and discuss them at length."

Well, if Sunday morning is the smartest time period on television—that is what Bob Schieffer says it is—I say another reason for that would be that it is Bob Schieffer's time when he is reporting to the Nation. He decries—as do I—the 30-second sound bite that has replaced the true interaction between voters and public officials. One reason I decry it, of course, is I am not very good at it. A 30-second sound bite—it takes me about that long to say hello or good morning.

Sitting in the anchor chair at CBS is a high responsibility, a high responsibility, an important responsibility. It was the chair from which Roger Mudd and Walter Cronkite would report every night. It was the chair in which Edward R. Murrow—perhaps the grandfather of in-depth, thorough television reporting—hosted "CBS Reports" and "Person to Person" and "See It Now." Edward R. Murrow set the standard. Bob Schieffer excels at meeting that standard.

There is no obstacle that cannot be overcome by the vigorous mind determined to follow truth. That seems to be the philosophy that guides the work of Bob Schieffer. He follows the truth. He has a vigorous mind, and he follows the truth, he keeps after it. He does not invent the truth. There is a difference in following and pursuing the truth and attempting to invent it. Bob Schieffer does not invent the truth, he asks the questions. He asks the questions, but he does not assume the answers. He listens and, from the answers he receives, we all then learn.

Bob Schieffer once told an audience, "Your trust is the greatest honor I can receive." Now that says it all. I am not a news man, but if I were a news reporter, it would seem to me that that would be the pith, the crux, the milk in the coconut. "Your trust is the greatest honor I can receive." We know that, as a general rule, the people of America do not trust news people. They do not trust news reporters. They do not trust the news media. They do not trust politicians. So Bob Schieffer said it well when he said, "Your trust is the greatest honor I can receive." He can speak for me as a politician on that line also. The trust of the people, he says, is the greatest honor he can receive. That trust is well earned.

I congratulate Mr. Schieffer on his decade of service at "Face the Nation," and I look forward to watching him for many years to come. He is a man I trust.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I, again, thank the Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. I so appreciate the remarks he made about my friend, Bob Schieffer, and "Face the Nation." I, too, have known Bob Schieffer for a long time. He grew up in Fort Worth, TX. His brother and I served together in the Texas Legislature. I have known him and his family for a long time.

There is not a more principled, fair person in the entire news media than Bob Schieffer. I certainly appreciate the kind remarks made by the Senator from West Virginia. I know Bob Schieffer is very happy tonight, celebrating the anniversary of "Face the Nation." He has taken it to new heights just by being a person who is trusted and respected by the American people. Both Presidential candidates choosing Bob Schieffer to be the moderator of a debate shows he is well regarded by Republicans, Democrats, and Independents throughout our country.

BETTER EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I want to talk about the education bill that is so important to all of us. We are hopefully very close to agreement on bringing the bill before the Senate.

We are all a little frustrated because we have been waiting for the bill for about 10 days. There have been a lot of negotiations.

There are some very key issues that need to be discussed, and I hope they will be discussed in the open. I hope they will not be negotiated away. Reform is the key to success in education.

We are going to spend more money on education. In fact, President Bush has put forward a budget that provides an 11.4-percent increase in spending in education. That is warranted because we do need to add emphasis to certain areas of public education.

What is going to determine success or failure is whether we reform our system, whether we make it accountable, whether we give parents the ability to know what their children are doing and how they are doing. If a child comes home with A's or B's and is promoted to the next grade, and you, as a parent, find out 5 years later the child did not read at grade level, that is a failure in the system.

If a parent does not have the tools to find out if there is a weakness in the child's education, the parent is at a significant disadvantage, and the child is doomed forever.

We need to make sure parents have the knowledge of how a school is doing. A lot of people say we should not have tests. If we do not have tests, how will we have a benchmark? How will we know where the weaknesses are?

If we have tests, even if the test is not perfect, it will show a red flag and we will see the weakness. We can determine if the test is not right, if the failure is not real. At least we will check on it to make sure, but most of the time the failure is real.

If we catch the failure at third grade instead of eighth grade, we will save that child's future. We will save that child's productive life because we can make sure that every child can read at grade level in the third grade. If we do that, then every child will have the chance to absorb the rest of his or her

educational experience. But that child will never be able to absorb the history, the geography, the math, and the science if that child cannot read at grade level in the third grade and have the chance to progress.

That is why we are trying to set a standard, not a mandate to every State about the test that is given but a mandate that there be some kind of accountability, some kind of test so parents know where the weaknesses are.

In addition, we want to take the schools that are doing well in the same socioeconomic area and give that information about what works to the school that is not doing well. That is the purpose of accountability: to find out what does work so we will have a chance to help those that are not performing up to speed by showing them what has worked in schools with the same weakness areas.

If it is reading that is a weakness, or math, or computer sciences, we will have some examples to show what does work because we do want to make sure no child is left behind.

We are talking about reforms that include accountability, some kind of testing to see where they are and where the weaknesses are. We are talking about creativity to make sure schools that have teacher shortages have a bigger pool from which to choose. If we do not have a teacher who can teach French and the students are not able to learn French in that school district, why not go the extra mile to certify a person who majored in French in college but does not happen to have a teacher's certificate? Why not expedite the teacher certification so the young people in that particular school district will be able to learn French?

That is what we are trying to do: give creativity incentives so there will be more teachers available to teach French, Russian, Japanese, or the Chinese language; more teachers who can teach math, science, and computer skills where there are teacher shortages.

We must be creative. We must leave no stone unturned to make sure every child will get the chance to succeed with a public education.

We are going to increase spending. We are going to triple the funding for children's reading programs to over \$1 billion next year. We will have a 30-percent increase in funding for Hispanic-serving institutions and historically black colleges because these programs, which have been increased for the last few years at a very large rate, are doing a great service for our country. They are nurturing students in those schools to keep them in school to get those degrees to be eligible for the good jobs that a college education can give them.

We are adding an additional \$1 billion for Pell grants next year. At colleges and universities where I have made commencement addresses, I have had so many students tell me it is Pell grants that are responsible for their

ability to get an education because their parents never could have afforded to send them. The Pell grants are an added incentive for them to go to college. In fact, one of the creative parts of this bill is increasing Pell grants by \$1,000 to any low-income student who will enter the math or science field in college.

That would be an exciting opportunity for our minority students, for our low-income students, for students who have not had a chance to have that extra Pell grant. If that extra Pell grant will give them an incentive to go into the field of math and science, then that student is going to have a bright future.

We are going to increase by \$412 million teacher professional development, making sure teachers have the tools they need to teach, that the best techniques are given to the teachers teaching our young people.

We are going to have a \$90 million increase in the National Science Foundation, the math and science partnerships program, so we can assure quality opportunities in math and science to nurture our potential inventors.

There is a \$40 million increase in school construction funding for impact aid schools. An impact aid school is a school that is near a military base. These are school districts that do not have the same tax base because a military installation does not pay local taxes. Many of these schools have been starved over the years. We are going to give them a boost to try to upgrade the school construction in these heavily impacted school districts where there are large Federal institutions.

There is a lot of increased spending in this bill. But that is not all this bill is. If we just increase spending, we don't need to debate the issues of reform; we don't need to talk about accountability; we don't need to talk about vouchers or choice for parents or charter schools or trying to get more teachers to take up the teaching profession. Why would we do that if we just throw money at it and not do anything more? We could just pass an appropriations bill. That is what we have been doing. That is what hasn't worked.

What we are hoping to do is to now reform the system. We want to give individual attention to every child. We are trying to give the Federal money in block grants to the State and local governments with benchmarks—not mandates, not heavy books of regulations they have to thumb through before they can take a step. That is not what we are trying to do.

We are saying: Here is the standard we want you to meet. We want every child to read at grade level at the third grade. How you do it is your choice. We will give you extra money for teaching teachers how to teach reading for Pell grants, for the added emphasis on math and science classes, all of those things that would go toward making sure each individual student has the opportunity

to reach his or her full potential with a public education. That is the point of this bill.

Increased accountability. Focus on what works. Look at the other schools to see what they do that works. Talk to people who have made it work.

I visited a school in my hometown of Dallas, TX, an elementary school. I have never seen so much creativity. The students have parents who are interested. The PTA is very active in the school. The principal welcomes the PTA. Stonewall Jackson Elementary School has a diverse student body. They are excited about learning. The teachers are pumped up; the principal is open and creative; the parents love working for the school. It works because everyone comes together to try to make sure every child has the most opportunity that child can have.

This particular school also has a number of deaf students. They are integrated into the elementary school. Deaf students and hearing students are in the same classes, so the hearing students know how to function with the deaf students; the deaf students know how to function with the hearing students. It is wonderful to see it work because of the interest of the parents, the teachers, the principal, the school superintendent, and school trustees. It is a teamwork effort. That is what we are trying to foster in every school in our country.

We want to reduce bureaucracy in Washington and increase flexibility. We want school districts to do what fits them best. Maybe they need a single-sex school in part of an urban area where they have problems with discipline. Why shouldn't they be able to offer an all-boys school or an all-girls school in a public school environment, if that is what the parents believe will focus their children on education. Why don't we open our horizons and look at what we can do to be more creative?

Most of all, we are trying to empower parents. We are trying to give parents the information they need to make the best decisions for their children. We are trying to make sure parents will be able to get their children out of a bad environment and into an environment where their child can learn and progress and do better. That is exactly what this bill is trying to do.

I am very pleased we have a President whose major priority is education. I am very pleased we have a bill that will put some creativity into the schools. I am very pleased we will have some amendments that I hope will add to the creativity and the choices parents will have. The bottom line is, if parents know what their children are learning and if they have an interest in their schools, they are not going to let their children stay in a bad environment; they are not going to let their children stay in an environment that is not serving the needs of their children.

I hope we can start the amendment process on this bill because I think we

have a chance to recreate public education in our country. It needs to be recreated. It has fallen down in the last 25 years. It is time we brought it back up. It is time we do not take no for an answer. It is time we do not allow someone to say that some children just can't learn. Every child can learn. We just must make sure we fit that child's individual needs and every child will learn. The key is catching the child early enough that we can give the child the full chance to have a quality public education. If we find out in the ninth grade that the child is reading at the third grade level, 6 years will have been lost for that child's development. That is not fair. We can do better. That is what I hope we will do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to continue under the time on education, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose we are all hopeful the committee will soon come together with their proposal and have some agreement on the bill and bring it here.

As we think more and more about the education bill, and we begin to think what are the elements of a successful education for young people, of course we immediately begin to think, first of all, about families, about parents. That is the early responsibility. It is so interesting to watch in our communities, as we see the youngsters with parents who, when the children are very small, begin to help with reading, begin to give parental support. Then as they get to school, we can see their opportunities are much greater.

The other things, of course, that we talk about are the facilities, the teaching opportunities that are provided by the community. We begin to try to put all these things together. Then we begin to say what is the role of dollars? I think the average expenditure per child is maybe \$500. There are substantial differences in the costs of education throughout the country. Then we begin to measure reading performance against the amount of dollars that are spent. We see as dollars go up, reading capacity does not necessarily go up. So we say what is it that has to be done besides dollars?

We begin to think of the role of the Federal Government versus the role of the school board and the State, in terms of decisions about school buildings, for example. Traditionally, the building of school facilities has been a responsibility of local governments. Local governments make the decisions. Then we find ourselves looking at things that need to be done in that area and we see we need Federal money. When Federal money comes, along with it comes regulation. People say: Wait a minute, get the Federal Government out of our lives.

It is not an easy issue. Do we want to have the best education we can? Of

course, nobody argues with that. That is our goal and it should be. We start with preschool and go on to have the best kind of education we possibly can have for everyone. Not only is that good for everyone, the people themselves, but it is good for our society. We cannot really have successful democracy unless we have educated citizens.

That is what we are talking about. It sounds easy: we are going to support schools, we are going to do this, we are going to do that. Then we think it out and say: How do we best do this? How do we get accountability? Where should the money come from? How important is it as compared to teaching expertise, for example? What does that have to do with buildings, facilities, and these things?

It is an interesting topic. I hope we will get to it soon. The bill before us will cover almost all these things. It will have to do with accountability. It will have to do with financial capacity. It will have to do with choice. It will have to do with how the money is spent and who decides that. I look forward to that.

I think the arrangements have been for the Senator from West Virginia to begin now, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from West Virginia.

BUSH TAX CUT PROPOSAL AND THE PSEUDO-RECESSION OF 2001

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, last Friday, the Commerce Department reported that the U.S. economy grew at a rate of 2 percent during the first 3 months of this year, January 2001 to March 2001. That is twice the rate that forecasters were projecting. It doubles the pace of late last year, October 2000 to December 2000.

Saturday's Washington Post quoted economist Jim Glassman of J.P. Morgan Securities saying:

These are great numbers. They suggest that the economy is not nearly as weak as was feared and that we are not close to being in a recession.

This information stands in stark contrast to what the administration has been telling the American people in recent months. In presenting his budget and tax cut proposals to a joint session of Congress on February 28, President Bush declared:

the long economic expansion that began almost 10 years ago is faltering.

As recently as March, White House aides warned that \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts were needed to avert an impending recession.

Contrary to the administration's dire warnings, the economy has continued its unbroken 10-year expansion—the longest economic expansion in U.S. history. The Nation's unemployment rate is near historic lows at 4.3 percent. Consumer spending increased from a 2.8 percent rate in February to a 3.1 percent rate in March. Construction

spending remains strong, business infrastructure investment is rising, manufacturing activity is inching up, and factory inventories are falling.

Even the stock markets—and we have learned that the stock market is not the economy—but even the stock markets are rebounding from their recent lows. The Dow Jones increased from 9,500 in early March to almost 10,900 yesterday—10,898.34—a 15 percent increase. The Nasdaq increased from 1,619 in March to 2,168 yesterday—a 34 percent increase.

In the midst of the Great Depression of 1932, which I lived through, President Franklin Roosevelt cautioned that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. In the midst of the pseudo-recession of 2001, the only thing that the Bush administration has to fear is stirring up public doubt.

This administration has been walking a fine line between promoting the President's tax cut proposal on the one hand and alarming consumers and investors. The Bush administration has touted the President's tax cut plan as a possible "second wind for economic growth," so that bad economic news becomes good news for the tax cut.

That is the tune the administration plays.

The problem is that, in attacking an illusory problem through the bogus cure of massive tax cuts, this Administration creates two very real problems. It threatens our debt repayment efforts and cuts back on our ability to address a backlog of infrastructure needs.

Let's consider, for a moment, our national debt. The Congressional Budget Office projects that the national debt will increase from its current levels of \$5.7 trillion to \$6.7 trillion in FY 2011. The President's budget would set aside \$2 trillion to retire the national debt over the next ten years, but that number is based on two highly unlikely assumptions: (1) that \$5.6 trillion in budget surpluses will materialize in spite of CBO warnings that they might not, and (2) that discretionary spending should be limited to the unrealistically low numbers proposed by the President.

If the massive-permanent tax cuts are enacted, our debt retirement efforts may be compromised and that could significantly disrupt the financial markets, resulting in higher interest rates and slower economic growth.

An equally important concern is whether these tax cuts will allow us to adequately address this country's failing infrastructure. Roads, bridges, airport runways, mass transit systems, water and sewer systems, and energy delivery systems—we could go on and on—are vitally important to support thriving businesses. They enhance productivity. They provide jobs. They are basic to a strong economy.

Yet, according to the American Society of Civil Engineers, ASCE, one-third of the nation's major roads are in poor or mediocre condition, costing American drivers an estimated \$5.8 billion a year.